

THE
INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS

OF

Homoeopathy in the United States;

AN INAUGURAL ADDRESS BEFORE
THE HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE COUNTY OF NEW YORK,
DELIVERED APRIL 11TH, 1864.

BY

STEPHEN R. KIRBY, M. D.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE COUNTY OF NEW YORK.

1864.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK, June 8th, 1864.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D.,

Dear Sir : At the regular quarterly meeting of the Homœopathic Medical Society of the County of New York, held this evening, the thanks of the Society were voted to you for your address delivered on the 10th of April, on the "*Introduction and Progress of Homœopathy in America*," and a copy thereof asked for publication.

Awaiting a favorably reply, I remain, Yours truly,

HENRY M. SMITH,

Secretary.

No. 31 WEST WASHINGTON PLACE,

June 10th, 1864.

Dear Colleague :

I received your official note, requesting my Address for publication. As it was in obedience to a rule of the Society the Address was delivered, it is at its disposal.

Very respectfully,

S. R. KIRBY.

To HENRY M. SMITH, M.D.,

Secretary.

ADDRESS.

Gentlemen of the Homœopathic Medical Society of the County of New York:

I thank you for the honor you have bestowed on me, and the proof of your esteem and confidence, in the choice of myself for the chief officer of your society. In compliance with a rule of the society, you meet at this time to receive an address from me by virtue of my office as President. I propose to show what Homœopathy is as developed by Hahnemann, and give a brief history of its Introduction and Progress in America. The subject is of value to science generally, to the medical profession specially, and to the people universally. It requires accuracy and exactness in the statement of its facts; and as individuals must be spoken of almost at every step, it requires a rigid sense of justice, a strict regard to truth, clearness of perception, impartiality in judgment, and proper terms of expression, to avoid detraction on the one hand, and too high praise on the other.

It is my purpose to avoid analyzing individual character, or saying much of any person on account of qualities he may have possessed, or of services he may seem to have rendered: for the reason, it is difficult, in truth, most likely it is impossible, where many are engaged in the same work, to assign to each a just measure of praise: and as there is a "Divinity that shapes our ends," bestowing praise on a person for yielding to inspirations he could not easily prevent, is, to my conception so much within the line of injustice, that I dare not follow the usual course in that

respect; for all truth originates and flows from God; therefore the introduction and development of it is His work: individuals are but the channels through which it flows. For this reason, I would not praise the channels, hardly notice them, but speak of that which passes through them: and thus acknowledge truth to be an emanation from the FATHER, bestowed upon man for man's good.

With these preliminaries, I go on to notice that in the course of human events, Hahnemann made known a mode or rather a system for the healing art, based upon positive physiological and psychological facts, by him expressed thus: "In health, the vital force which dynamically animates the material body, exercises an unlimited power. It preserves every part of the organism in an admirable vital harmony, as regards sensation and action, so that the spirit which resides in us, and which is endowed with reason, is able freely to employ these living and healthy instruments, for the purpose of accomplishing the high end of our existence."

This is the basis of what is termed Homœopathy. Its basis is not, as some suppose, "*similia similibus curentur*;" this is but a branch of the system, and subscribing to this alone does not constitute one a Homœopathist, as I hope to prove. Now, be kind enough, without prejudice, to go with me into an examination of the above quotation from "The Organon of Homœopathic Medicine, by Samuel Hahnemann." I shall assume, speaking generally, that its meaning is not clearly comprehended by all the members of our school; and from this defect, the spirit of Allopathy still mingles and exerts its pernicious influence in the practice of the art of healing. Hahnemann agrees with St. Paul in what constitutes a man, viz., body, spirit and soul. Of the body I shall say almost nothing; of the soul, but little; but ask your attention to the physiological fact in the term spirit.

Volumes might be written on this subject; yet I shall at-

tempt to bring to view what essentially constitutes life, or vitality, or spirit of man. The term vital force is expressed by the word dynamism; that is, spirit in action. To me it seems necessary that I should notice in the first place what is meant by mind. What is it? Whatever else it may be, it is that in us which takes cognizance of material things, and enables us to give them shape and expression. It is a result of brain action; its relations are strictly mathematical; it belongs to matter; it conceives of nothing else, and measures all things by a material standard.

Ideas may be the result of a superior intelligence, but the conclusions the mind draws from them are always material: that is to say, the mind is of the body, through which the soul reaches the outward world. The human body is the clothing of the mind; the brain is its organ or machine, and the motive power is the soul. All the senses are used to convey to the mind external objects of whatever nature. In our bodies we perceive a principle, or a power, which develops phenomena. The results of this principle we term life. I cannot define what it is in essence, nor is it necessary; for it is a fact, what is useless to man, GOD has made impossible to him.

Life is a reality, and is most closely allied to matter. Is it electricity? Is it magnetism? Is it the dynamism of material bodies? Is it itself material? It causes the circulation of the blood—it controls the functions of the human body and of all animal bodies. Whatever it may be in essence, it may be named *spirit*, and it is the cause of the phenomena we know by the word *life*. It is everywhere; causes life to circulate in the germ, and sends the sap upwards from the root through all the branches of the tree. It exists, but it has no *thought*, for it is controlled by that within, as Hahnemann has it, “which is endowed with reason,” that is, the soul—the image of GOD in man. That it be in substance electricity, is possible, for this is found in modified forms in all bodies. It has not conscious intelli

gence like the mind, but "it is a diffusive material substance which pervades all nature and gives life and shape to that which otherwise were dead and void of form;" itself being managed by fixed laws established by the CREATOR.

In the human organization there is something distinct from the outward decaying bodily structure, on the one hand, and the inner divine immortal principle on the other.

Now, to me it seems that there must be something intermediate, a sort of connecting link,—a bond of union—between the material and the immaterial. Inert matter and divine life can hardly be in immediate contact. What then in man is between his system of nerves, through which sensation and intelligence are transmitted and his essential soul? What is it that influences the contraction of muscles and the blood circulation? It is the principle of life or spirit, or as Hahnemann has it, "the vital force which dynamically animates the material body." The mind is cold and mathematical in operation and effect. Spirit is warm, genial and diffusive. Mind concentrates its action on single points and on material objects. Spirit is fixed nowhere, but is everywhere to answer the purposes of life; and this may bind the finite to the infinite; the unseen power that unites the visible to the invisible; this is the impalpable presence, you perceive, which conveys to you the ideas I am uttering. For while mind is the result of the creation of thoughts, spirit is the medium of their transmission, and is the universal principle of life.

My dear colleagues, all this, and much more, I perceive in the profound teaching through Hahnemann, in the quotation I read to you. This, I repeat, is the basis of Homœopathy. Everything built upon this must be in strict harmony with it. Let us see. Hahnemann says: "In disease, this spiritual force, which is active in itself, and universally present in the body, is the only one which at first perceives the dynamic influence of the agent hostile to life.

Having been disturbed by this perception, this force becomes capable of communicating to the organism the disagreeable sensations which it experiences, and of driving it to those unusual actions we call diseases." "It is only the disturbed vital force that produces diseases."

This definition of disease is enough of itself to revolutionize the materialistic doctrine of the allopathic school.

2. The same spiritual power Hahnemann found in drugs; and that in each existed a force peculiar to itself, and capable of disturbing the healthy acting life principle in the human organism, developing phenomena like unto diseases from other causes. He also proved that each drug by its own spirit power could modify disease; that is, "it is in the dynamic action of drugs that their inherent force exclusively consists.

3. Hahnemann announced that drugs cured diseases by virtue of a law, "*similia similibus curentur*," or like may be cured by like. This law he did not believe, nor is it the cardinal principle of Homœopathy; but only, as it is, the basis of the therapeutic branch of it.

4. "Every physician," says Hahnemann, "adopting a treatment of such a general character, however unblushingly he may affect to be an Homœopathist, is and will always remain a generalizing Allopathist, *as without the most especial individualization Homœopathy has no meaning.*"

I have thus brought to view the four propositions embraced by Homœopathy; in fact they constitute it. No one of them can be overlooked in prescribing drugs for a disease. I conclude this branch of my discourse in the language of Dr. Cosnec of Paris, viz., "No, there does not and cannot exist any conciliation between the two schools; whether Homœopathy be considered in its principles or in its method and means, there can be no possible conciliation. Homœopathy, being a radical reform in medicine, can concede nothing to the allopathic doctrine; to try to conciliate the two schools, would be a step to the denial

“of Homœopathy.” In the prosecution of my purpose I will now proceed to speak of the introduction and progress of Homœopathy in this country.

In the year 1826, Dr. Hans Birch Gram came to this city from Copenhagen, and in 1827 he translated and published “The Spirit of the Homœopathic Doctrine,” by SAMUEL HAHNEMANN. A few copies were circulated, but received little or no attention from the profession. In 1830 Professor E. Geddings, of Charleston, S. C., published a review of Homœopathy in the “American Journal of Medical Sciences,” which, for fairness, learning and dignified liberality, has not been equaled by any other allopathic writer on Homœopathy. I think it worthy a place in this discourse. How much it contributed to fix the attention to the new doctrine, of such men, in Philadelphia, as Drs. Charles F. Matlack, Jonas Green, Jacob Jeans, Gideon Humphrey, Matthew Anderson, Wm. S. Helmuth, James Kitchen, Samuel Freedley and W. Williamson, all graduates of the University of Pennsylvania, and converts to Homœopathy, I do not know. Prof. Gedding’s review could have hardly escaped their notice, as it was published in the city of their residence.

Prof. G. said—“Another peculiarity of the homœopathic system of cure is: that the properties of these remedies are to be tested by repeated experiments upon individuals who are in perfect state of health, instead of the usual plan of administering them to those who are diseased. In conducting these experiments, the most patient and unwearyed attentions have been bestowed by the Homœopaths, not only in guarding scrupulously against all sources of contingent influence, but likewise in noticing, with the greatest exactitude, the multifarious changes produced in the several functions of the system, as the pulse, temperature, respiration, secretions and excretions, sensations, volitions, &c. With a firmness of purpose, and a spirit of perseverance which scarcely admits a parallel, Dr. Hahnemann and some

of his followers have submitted an immense number of the most active articles of the *materia medica* to this ordeal of experience; in the execution of which, their stomachs have been tortured in a thousand forms, the thought of which the modern Broussaisan, wrought up to a high pitch by his constant dread of *gastro-enteritis*, could not regard but with consternation and horror. Amongst the articles that have been tested by the Hahnemannians, we find many of the most energetic character, and some appertaining to the class of active poisons, as Belladonna, Hyoscyamus, Arsenic, &c. Some idea may be formed of the diligence with which experiments of this nature are conducted, and the extreme nicety with which symptoms are discriminated and noted down by the Homœopaths, when we state, that to many of the articles we find affixed more than a thousand symptoms, observed as the result of their operations on the living organization.

According to Hahnemann's views, the organization is much more readily affected by the artificial than by the natural disease; consequently, a very small quantity of medicine is sufficient to excite that degree of action which is requisite to supplant the primary morbid affection. Acting upon this principle, the Homœopaths have been gradually reducing the doses of their medicines, until they have brought them down to an exiguity, which almost staggers the easiest credulity.

The items of scruples and drachms do not figure in the homœopathic pharmacopœia; and even grains and minims only meet the eye, as masses of matter which have to be reduced to decimal portions, as numerous almost as the sands on the sea-shore. The grand ultimatum, with the practitioner, is to ascertain the smallest quantity which can possibly affect the organization with sufficient intensity to transcend the organic movement already existing; and to attain this, the different articles have been reduced to infinitesimal quantities, which the known principles of arith-

metic are scarcely competent to enumerate. It is assumed as a law by the Homœopaths, that the activity of medicines does not decrease in the ratio of the reduction of the dose. Thus says Hahnemann: "Eight drops of the tincture of any medicinal substance do not operate with four times the activity of two drops, but with not more than twice the power. If we add a single drop of a medicine to ten drops of any simple fluid, and take one drop, we shall not have an impression produced of tenfold greater intensity than that which would be developed by a drop of the same article added to one hundred drops of the fluid, but scarcely double the effect."

Here we have a fair view of the sort of labor Hahnemann and his followers had engaged in, and no fault found with it. The matter embraced in the review has been the subject of much controversy in the school, and even yet many who seek to rank of the school reject the dynamic action of medicines; and by the use of massive doses of drugs, obtain either a mechanical or chemical action, by the latter acting "on the material elements of the organism with which they are brought in contact."

It is out of place for me to say more on this subject. In seeking to know why, with Dr. Gram here, in 1826; and Dr. Folger, a native of this city and a professed convert, in 1827; and Dr. Gray, in 1828 or '29; and the late Dr. A. D. Wilson, in 1830, Homœopathy had seemingly made little or no progress until 1832, and then attracted but little attention, only in the treatment of the cholera by small doses of camphor; an explanation of this somewhat remarkable fact I find in a letter of Dr. A. Gerald Hall, dated "December, 1840," addressed to Dr. Scott, of Glasgow, and published in *The Homœopathic Examiner*. In this letter are these words, viz: "Your course in Scotland is just such as that pursued by the late Dr. Gram and his friend, Dr. Gray, the first American confessor of Homœopathia. They continued from 1826 till 1832, to observe a silence on the

subject, which was much blamed by the later converts. I was during these years an earnest student and adherent of the science, and approved their course till the year 1834, when Dr. Gray and myself published the *American Journal of Homœopathia*. The *Geist* had been published here in 1826, and the reception it met determined the translator, Dr. Gram, to publish no more till the state of the subject in Europe rendered it opportune to do so. Our publications in 1834 were still too early for public opinion here; but it occurred in 1833 that imperfectly educated and unscrupulous physicians began to *drive a trade* in the new system, by a series of mountebank arts. This proceeding rendered it necessary to forestall the consequences of this despicable, but certainly not surprising conduct."

This letter explains what, not unfrequently, has been the subject of conversation among members of the profession in this city. Dr. Gray was not acquainted with Dr. Gram in 1826. That they observed a "silence" on Homœopathy, I know; that it was "too early for public opinion here," was either a flimsy pretext, or a mistake in judgment. Who were embraced in the "imperfectly educated and unscrupulous physicians," etc., I do not know. Dr. John Granger, a French gentleman, came to this city from Paris in April, 1833. He announced to the public the doctrine of Homœopathy as taught by Hahnemann, and opened an Institution for the treatment of diseases. He was a Hahnemannian in practice, and was employed by several wealthy and well known families. I saw Dr. Granger a few days ago; he told me he was urged to withdraw his publication from circulation and "observe a silence on the subject," which he refused to do.

In 1834 Drs. Vanderburgh, Gray and Hull, with eight laymen, formed an association which published four numbers of a periodical entitled, "*American Journal of Homœopathia*." This is what Dr. Hull refers to in his letter: "our publications in 1834 were still too early for public opinion here;" that

is, as I know, the movement was a failure. Drs. Gram, Wilson, Channing and myself were not of it.

A pamphlet recently published and entitled, "The Early Annals of Homœopathy in New York," by John F. Gray, M. D., supplies a historical fact which relieves me of some embarrassment; for in the absence of the statement of the author of "The Early Annals" etc., I should be compelled to rely on my own unsupported testimony; for only Dr. Gray and myself remain of those who have personal knowledge on the subject previous to 1834. From the above named pamphlet I quote these words: "With Channing's conversion, came also the first divergence in practice among the Homœopathists in this country. He was a thorough Hahnemannian in all his views and practice, which neither of his predecessors was. Gram, Wilson, Hull and myself held from first to last, that those expedients of the old practice which had attained a solid basis of empirical certainty as to good results in given and well defined cases of disease, ought not to be laid aside." Here we have a frank admission that Dr. Gram and three others did not abandon old school theories, nor old school practices, notwithstanding the attempt at qualification. So much as Drs. Gram and Wilson are concerned, I know what is here stated to be true. I have no right to question, nor do I, the reality and honesty of the conceptions of these gentlemen, and their good faith in clinging to the "empirical certainty" of "expedients," in old school practice. The above fact from "The Early Annals" induced me in this address to show what Homœopathy is; lest when I speak of its introduction and progress in our country, I might, in the clamor of men for claims of precedence, mistake Allopathy or Mongrelism in a crafty form of words for true Homœopathy.

Whatever progress may be made in the science and art of medicine, as yet, I am safe in assuming Hahnemann as authority in teaching what Homœopathy is; and also what should be its practice. It is not only egotistical but absurd

for any one to admit "divergence" from those who receive Hahnemann's teachings, unless accompanied by a full record of carefully conducted experiments appropriate to test the question at issue.

To my apprehension, the Author of "The Early Annals" assumes for himself and those he names an influence in our school, which I do not believe was ever acknowledged. It is claimed that these gentlemen caused "the first divergence in practice among the Homœopaths in this country." How could this be? For it is said "from first to last" they rejected the "views and practice" of Hahnemann. I think these gentlemen have slight claims to rank as Homœopaths.

In the summer of 1832 the cholera prevailed epidemically in this city. The term Homœopathy was not at all familiar in the profession at that time. Drs. Gram, Wilson, Channing and myself were the only ones who treated that disease chiefly with *Camphor*. Our practice was ridiculed on account of the small doses; it was termed the "small dose camphor treatment." Dr. Gray was absent from the city.

In the winter of 1838 Dr. W. Channing was chosen to deliver a discourse at the anniversary meeting of physicians in this city. In this discourse he brought fully to view the doctrine and practice of Homœopathy as developed by Hahnemann. This address was published. Whatever may have been done by individuals in private practice from 1832 to '38, I cannot estimate; but I know that all of us regularly attended the meetings of the old school County Society of which we were members, and took part in its proceedings; several of us were officers, and no unusual feelings manifested to us until after the delivery of Dr. Channing's address. In all fairness, then, pure Homœopathy was first introduced in this city in 1838, and Dr. Wm. Channing is entitled to the credit of it. In Philadelphia, Pa., in 1829, Dr. John Ihn, said to have come from New York, pretended to practice Homœopathy. Who he was I do not know. In 1831, Dr. G. M.

Bute located in that city. He had been a student of Dr. Constantine Hering.

Dr. Wm. Wesselhœft was practising in Bath, Northampton Co., Pa. in 1830. "He was a scholar of note, and a professor in one of the large German universities, before his adoption of Homœopathy." He died three years ago in Boston. While in Bath he induced Drs. Freitag, Detwiller and Helfig to become Homœopaths. The latter was the means of converting Dr. Pulte. Dr. Constantine Hering came to this country in 1833 and joined Dr. Bute in the practice. In 1833, Dr. J. Romig was in the practice in Allentown, Pa. These men were Homœopaths in the Hahnemann sense; they did not "observe a silence on the subject," nor did they wait, till the state of the subject in Europe rendered it opportune to publish to the profession in America what Homœopathy is.

In 1835, says Dr. Walter Williamson of Philadelphia, the friends of Homœopathy obtained from the Legislature of Pennsylvania a charter for the "North American Academy of the Homœopathic Healing Art," which was placed under the auspices of Drs. Constantine Hering, John Romig, William Wesselhœft, Eberhard Freitag, Henry Detwiller and their co-laborers. These men, learned and experienced, had lost all confidence in "the expedients of the old practice," and did not perceive how "empirical certainty" could make "a solid basis" in the art of healing or in any thing else. They at once undertook the publication in English, of "The Organon of Homœopathic Medicine," by Hahnemann, and also the *Materia Medica* and a *Repertory*. These were published simultaneously in 1835, and this was the Introduction of Homœopathy into America. All that preceded were mere glimmerings, but when the *Organon* came, the true light in all its beauty, splendor and fullness was shed upon the profession and the people of America. Thus the royal standard of medical truth, which is Hahnemann's *Organon*, was introduced into our country. By it in the

past, and by it in the present, we judge of the soundness of our faith. By it, we justly judge every man who claims allegiance to the homœopathic school of medicine. Soon converts multiplied in Pennsylvania,—I have already recorded the names of a few of them. In addition were Drs. William Schnoele, Henry Schnoele, Charles Neidhard, Samuel Freedly, Richard Gardner, George Lingen, C. B. Mathews, A. Lippe and G. Reichhelm. With but few exceptions these were good and true men, always faithful to the standard. These men, I borrow the words of Dr. Gray, with “Channing went up promptly with Hahnemann in his doses, fully believing in the potentizing process and faith of the master,” and even after the death of Hahnemann, they proved that it was not “going out of the roof of all scientific observation” to respect the “enthusiast Jenichen of Hanover.”

The publication of the *Organon* and a *Materia Medica* and *Repertory* was soon followed by many accessions to the school. As soon as possible I procured a copy of the works, and through them perceived I had an imperfect knowledge of Homœopathy. I had with the rest “observed a silence on the subject,” for the reason, that I did not know enough to defend myself against my old school education. I was under conviction, but not fully converted.

There went out from the Allentown college many true Homœopathicians. Dr. Reichhelm, from the University of Halle in Germany, arrived in this country in the Autumn of 1834. He was associated with Hering and Wesselhœft in their college. He was a strict disciple of Hahnemann, rarely if ever using drugs lower than the thirtieth attenuation. A clergyman in Pittsburgh wrote to Dr. Hering in 1837 for a physician for that city. Reichhelm consented to go, and went. The clergyman alone gave him a hearty welcome. Soon Dr. R. was employed as the attending physician to the “Pittsburgh Orphan Asylum.” The success of his practice in the “Iron city” for nearly twelve years was almost without a parallel. Dr. R. sternly refused countenance to

a mixed practice. I hope the twenty practitioners now in that city are governed by his example. Dr. Pulte also in some way connected with the Allentown school, in 1837 planted the standard of Homœopathy in Cincinnati. In 1840 he was joined by Dr. Bauer from the same school. At the present time Cincinnati abounds with physicians of our school.

I shall not attempt to name the physicians who first located in the cities and chief towns of our country; nor can I at present give the number who profess to be Homœopathicians; for we do not count by hundreds, but by thousands.

It is a fact worthy of notice, that where the Hahnemannian practice was introduced first, its adherents amongst the people are the most numerous, and the most zealous in its behalf. I could name cities where attempts have been made to introduce Homœopathy by a mixed practice without success. Search the country through and where Homœopathy is the most respected, there the principles of the system are strictly observed; the medicated pellets have potency enough to cure the sick.

Dr. A. Lippe, who probably has the largest practice in Philadelphia, is a ardent Hahnemannian. He feels no fellowship with mongrels. In a letter to me, dated March 24th, 1863, he says of mongrels: "If they cannot follow Hahnemann any further than to the point where they imagine, 'began the great error of *the* great man,' that is, the theory of potencies, let them turn back into the scientific slaughter fields of pathological uncertainties. With you I have made the same discovery, that we cure better the smaller we give the doses, and the smaller we give the doses the better we select the remedy; it gives us more pleasure to select accurately, because *we know* the result is a reward for our pains. In the most acute diseases I have given only the higher potencies, and was always satisfied with the result, provided I was true in all particulars. I have yet to see

the first case in which the high potencies when properly selected, and when the proper time was given, refuse to produce the desired effect; and in no case where no such results followed, did the lower potencies answer better. The potency question has long been settled in my mind, and our bitterest adversaries must finally come over to us." This is strong testimony and should receive attention.

The late Dr. R. A. Snow was a rigid Hahnemannian. He removed from this city to Wilkesbarre, Pa. His predecessor told him in my presence, that he would be compelled to use large and repeated doses of *Quinine* or he could not cure the fevers of that place. Dr. Snow soon had a large practice, and he told me he had secured the confidence of the people because of his success in the treatment of these fevers, rather than of any other disease, and that he had not used any drug lower than the thirtieth attenuation. Homœopathy is embraced in the four propositions I have named, having a solid physiological and psychological basis. Therefore within its limits is ample room for new developments, and this would be progression in the right direction.

I could name many who embraced Homœopathy by means of the *Organon*. My friend Dr. James M. Quin, a graduate of 1830, told me he had read the *Organon* fully through four times, and became convinced that Hahnemann had developed truth in medicine. By the same means in 1841, Dr. W. R. Browne embraced Homœopathy. He removed from this state to Texas, and until his death he was faithful to the principles of our art, and successful in practice. Dr. Temple of St. Louis is another. I regret to say, I fear there are professed Homœopaths who have not read the *Organon* once, and a few I knew a year ago had not seen the book. These have confidence in the "expedients of the old practice," and have no faith in high dilutions.

One of the most intimate and truest friends I ever had in

the profession; a man of education and a genuine brother in the brotherhood of man; could never divest himself of allopathic generalization in his attempts to practice Homœopathy. He held to the specious idea of "those expedients of the old practice which had attained a solid basis of empirical certainty," which dynamically influenced him from "first to last." If any of us, my dear Colleagues, are thus diseased, allow me to advise repeated doses of Hahnemann's Organon of Homœopathic medicine, and the cure is *certain*.

Many publications have appeared in the form of periodicals and works on practice which I cannot specially notice. Few of those for domestic use are of any value.

Drs. James M. Quin, P. P. Wells and myself established the first Dispensary in 1847; since then Dispensaries have become numerous in this and other cities in our country.

In 1848 the first College of our school went into operation in Philadelphia; then followed soon thereafter the college in Cleveland, Ohio; another in St. Louis, Mo. and in Chicago, Illinois; and four years ago, another in this city. These institutions still exist, and, so far as I know, are prosperous; the one in New York I know is so.

In conclusion, I have no apology to make for what I have said. I have no personal feelings to gratify, but those of truth and justice. I have the same respect for him who honestly differs from me in doctrine and practice, as for him who agrees with me. I individualize my fellow men, as Homœopathy individualizes cases of disease. The FATHER of us all never created identities, although some men have attempted to do so, and thought they had accomplished it, and announced it to the profession under the name of Iso-pathology. There are human organizations that never have other than materialistic ideas of disease and its treatment. These can never fully believe in the dynamic activity of a drug. Possibly they admit by glimmerings in their calmer moments, that what Hahnemann taught of diseases and of the law of cure is plausible and may be true; but his

doctrine of drug attenuations is not in the axis of their vision—they do not see it—it is not sufficiently materialistic for them. I do not charge these men with, nor would I insinuate, insincerity. I know men who have gone hence, whose names are recorded in the list of Homœopaths, and who have been lauded as such; who left no evidence of any clear conception of Homœopathy, either of its doctrine or practice. From a long and intimate acquaintance with them I never doubted their sincerity.